BOOK REVIEWS

INTEGRATING THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE ORGANIZA-
TION. By Chris Argyris. New York: John
Wiley and Sons, 1964. 330 pp. $5.95.

The objective of Argyris' most recent venture is
to bring the reader up to date in regard to his
thinking and theorizing since the publication of his
Personality and Organization in 1957. Those
readers familiar with Argyris' previous efforts
(especially the work mentioned above and *Under-
standing Organizational Behavior,* published in
1960) may be a bit disappointed. The original
contributions set forth in the 1957 volume greatly
exceed those set forth here, and the 1960 volume
summarizes his position at that time with greater
clarity and conciseness than is characteristic of
this installment.

Congruency or incongruency between individual
needs and organizational demands and the con-
sequences of the same for both the individual and
the organization is the main focus of all three
volumes. The range of possibilities considered
(different types of personalities and organizations
and combinations of the two) has increased with
each publication and new concepts have been sub-
stituted for old ones, but the approach remains
basically the same.

The central focus of *Integrating the Individual
and the Organization* is a constructive typology
termed the "mix model," a single model useful
in describing both personalities and organizations.
The model consists of six continua derived from
the concept "organization" itself. The right ex-
tremes of the continua represent the "basic prop-
erties" of the concept "organization" and the left
extremes represent their logical opposites. When
both personality and organization are best de-
scribed by the right ends of the continua, there
is (under certain conditions) maximum likelihood
of both organizational effectiveness and psycho-
logical success. More explicitly, in terms of the
"mix model," the probability of this increases as
both personality and organization move:

1. From a situation in which a part (or subset of
   parts) directs the organizational core activities
   (achieving the objectives, maintaining the in-
   ternal system, and adapting to the environment)
   to the point where these core activities are in-
   fluenced through interrelationships of parts...
2. From awareness of the organization as a (ran-
   dom) plurality of parts to awareness of the
   organization as a pattern of parts...
3. From a state in which the objectives being
   achieved are related to the parts, to a state in
   which the objectives being achieved are related
   to the whole...
4. From a state in which the organization is un-
   able to influence its internally oriented activi-
   ties (achieving its objectives, maintaining the in-

ternal system) to a state in which it can in-
fluence these activities as the organization de-
sires...
5. From a state in which the organization is un-
   able to influence its externally oriented activi-
   ties (adapting to the external environment) to
   a state in which it can influence these activities
   as the organization desires.
6. From a state in which the nature of the core
   activities (achieving the objectives, maintaining
   the internal system, and adapting to the en-
   vironment) is largely determined by the present
   to a state in which the present core activities
   are continually influenced by considerations in-
   cluding past history, the present and the antici-
   pated future of the organization . . . (pp. 151-
   54).

"Positive mental health" is best described by
the right ends of the continua when (roughly
speaking) the term personality is substituted for
the term organization in the above model. Argyris
readily admits that under certain circumstances
and in certain situations, organizations best de-
scribed by the right ends of the continua may be
neither effective nor contribute to psychological
success. Using these continua, he sets up different
organizational profiles, provides examples of each,
and suggests certain conditions under which each
profile or structural type may be best used. The
model itself proves to be an effective framework
for synthesizing the works of others. He suggests
the organization of the future may be a flexible one
capable of changing strategies (e.g., style of leader-
ship) in order to cope with different kinds of prob-
lems and tasks. As the reader may have anticipated
by now, Argyris believes traditional organizations
(bureaucracies) are best described by the left ends
of the continua.

The use of models similar to the "mix model"
at the organizational level has antecedents in the
literature of sociology, social psychology, and in-
dustrial administration. Argyris himself points
this out in that he compares it with models previ-
ously set forth by Likert, Litwak, McGregor, and
others. The model's use at *both* personality and
organizational levels is explicit here, but has cer-
tainly been at least implied in the author's previous
works. Thus, anyone expecting *major* contribu-
tions to this theoretical perspective in this volume
may be disappointed. (The major contributions to
date have already been made *by Argyris* in his
previous works.)

Other than making much of what he has im-
plied explicit and extending his perspective, the
book's chief merit stems from Argyris' copious
citation of other studies, many of which are
centrally related to his theoretical perspective, but
which are unpublished or appear in journals prob-

ably not read regularly by sociologists. Thus, readers with special interest (research, teaching, or application) in this area will find the book a valuable bibliographic aid.

Although described by the author as his *preliminary* thinking and theorizing, he reminds the reader of this, inserts cautions, qualifications and reservations, and indicates the absence of empirical studies to the point that it is distracting to the reader. By *almost* any set of criteria, this reviewer would suggest the book will be useful to industrial sociologists and students of complex organization. By the standards Argyris himself has established in his previous works, this one falls short.

CHARLES M. BONJEAN

The University of Texas

ALIENATION AND FREEDOM: THE FACTORY WORKER AND HIS INDUSTRY. By Robert Blauner. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964. 222 pp. Illustrated. $7.50.

That traditional questions in sociology do not have traditional answers is demonstrated by Blauner's study of alienation and freedom among industrial workers in America. Fundamental to his attack on the problem is the contention that the technology, division of labor, social organization and economic structure of industry are too diversified to make simple, scientific generalizations about the condition of industrial man. Four different types of industries were selected to establish this contention: craft printing, textile manufacturing, automobile manufacturing, and chemical production. Building upon the theoretical refinements on alienation proposed by Seeman and others, Blauner demonstrates that workers in different types of industries differ in their feelings of powerlessness, meaninglessness, social alienation and self-estrangement.

The data on alienation which Blauner uses were obtained from a 1947 job-attitude survey conducted by Elmo Roper for *Fortune* of 3,000 blue-collar workers. The responses of the workers in the four industries selected were intensively examined for hints about alienation and freedom. Supplementary data on the technology, division of labor, economic structure, and other features of the industries were gathered from existing literature, with the single exception of the automated chemical industry in which Blauner himself interviewed 21 workers in three different departments.

The conclusions drawn from these four "case studies" are clear. The printer lives in an integrated occupational community which gives his life and work meaning and purpose. His craft monopoly normally enables him to control his working conditions and economic fate, encourages his self-expression, and builds his self-esteem. He is a free and integrated worker. In contrast, the

technology and work organization of the cotton mill isolate the worker from others, depriving him of power over his work which is further rendered meaningless by extreme rationalization and mechanization. Even though he is not involved in his work and even though he has low occupational aspirations, he remains loyal to his employer because he lives in a tradition-bound small community where life is integrated by the family, religion, and occupational ties. The job of the automobile assembly line worker is the most fractionized, most subject to pressure, most meaningless, most insecure, and least subject to his control. As expected, the Roper data revealed that he ranked highest on all the alienation dimensions.

Blauner feels that the continuous process technology in some automated industries has reversed the historic trend toward greater division of labor and specialization, and the accompanying alienating tendencies. His data reveal that employees in the chemical industry have relative economic security, and greater responsibility and freedom at work, because they can in part control the pace and quality of work. Their greater integration with work teams not only increases their colleaguial feelings, but enhances their identification with the firm.

The major contribution of Blauner's important work is the theoretical and empirical specifications of the nexus between different types of industrial social structures (as measured by variations in technology, divisions of labor and economic organization) and the various dimensions of work alienation. Like most research in industrial sociology, this study has implications for all types of work organizations. The shortcomings of the research are minor in comparison to its theoretical relevance and substantive contribution. Unfortunately, the Roper attitudinal data only loosely correspond to the dimensions of alienation under investigation. Moreover, the studies utilized to provide social structural data on the industries selected are not of uniform quality and coverage. Ideally, alienation and social structural data should be derived simultaneously from the same carefully selected industries.

On the theoretical side, Blauner has not systematically considered the sources of social integration found in a wide range of industrial, family, and community settings. Only when a theory of alienation and integration is considered simultaneously within a broader framework will it be possible to account not only for a wide range of seemingly anomalous findings, but also for small differences among industries with similar social structures. Blauner, however, has clearly pointed the way for future studies to follow. His work, that of Sayles, and others which systematically examine social structure may be able one day to provide a more parsimonious approach to the study of the wide range of social psychological phenomena